

1	2	3	4
---	---	---	---

GULBARGA DISTRICT

1. Shahapur
2. Chincholi	1,128.32
3. Afzalpur
4. Shorapur
5. Chittapur	4.00
6. Jawarigi
7. Gulbarga	91.34
8. Aland	102.00
9. Sedam	21.08
10. Yadgiri	48.18

BIDAR DISTRICT

1. Bidar	316.10
2. Humnabad	18.00
3. B. Kalyan	43.00
4. B. Bhalki
5. Aurad	4.04

Total	..	98.30	5,227.39

SECOND REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES

Presentation.

Sri R. NAGAN GOWDA (Hospet).—Sir I beg to present the Second Report of the Committee on Government Assurances.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The report is presented to the House.

**BOMBAY PROVINCIAL MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
EXTENSION AND AMENDMENT BILL, 1968**

Motion to refer to Joint Select Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now we go to next item, namely motion for concurrence to the appointment of a Joint Select Committee to consider the Bombay Provincial Municipal Corporations (Extension and Amendment) Bill, 1968.

†**Sri M. NAGAPPA.**—Sir, I rise to a point of order. My point of order arises under rule 74, proviso to sub-rule (4). It reads thus :

“ No motion that a bill be referred to a Joint Select Committee shall be made with reference to a Bill making provision for any of the matters specified in sub-clauses (a) to (f) of clause (1) of Article 199 of the Constitution :

Provided that no such motion shall be made until after copies of the Bill have been made available for the use of members and that any member may object to any such motion being made unless copies of the Bill have been so made available for two days before the day on which the motion is made and such objection shall prevail, unless the Speaker allows the motion to be made.”

Copies of the bill were made available to members only yesterday. They could have been made available two days earlier to the members for their consideration. The proviso to sub-rule (4) is mandatory and so that objection will prevail.

I submit that it may not be allowed to be moved at this stage because it is a bulky bill containing more than 100 pages. Members have to go through them and make their suggestions for the consideration of the Joint Select committee. So unless we have sufficient time to go through the bill, the motion cannot be allowed to be moved. I submit the Speaker may not exercise his power vested in him by the last sentence of this sub-rule by overruling my objection. It will not be proper. Heaven will not fall if this is taken up in the next session. So I submit that my point of order may be upheld and the Minister may be asked to move it some time later.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—I would invite your attention to rule 242. Here the relevant rule is not 74 but rule 242 and under that rule no time limit is prescribed. Therefore the point of order that my friend has raised is not in order.

Sri L. SRIKANTAIAH.—Sir, I have a doubt and I want a clarification. This Bill has been referred to this House by the Legislative Council, but the question arises whether this Bill was introduced in this House prior to the motion that is now being made. Without a discussion on this Bill by this House, can this House agree to the proposition that this Bill be referred to a Joint Select Committee?

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—Sir, rule 74 (1) should be read with rule 109. No sooner a motion has been passed by the Upper House to refer a Bill to a Joint Select Committee, under rule 109 the motion along with a copy of the Bill should be placed on the table of the House. Rule 242 to which the Hon'ble Minister referred lays down the procedure. We have to go through the entire Bill before we agree with the proposition of the Upper House. Simply because the Upper House has come to the conclusion and decided to refer this Bill to a Joint Select Committee, we cannot agree with it; we might differ from it. We can say that we do not want a Joint Select Committee but want only a Select Committee. We have to take into consideration the motion along with the Bill; we cannot consider only the motion. Unless we discuss the provisions of the Bill, we cannot say whether it is to be referred to a Joint Select Committee or a Select Committee. So, what the Learned Minister for Parliamentary Affairs has said is not proper and the motion won't come under rule 242. I therefore request that my point of order may be upheld.

Sri M. S. KRISHNAN (Malleswaram).—Sir, Proviso to rule 73(1) lays down that copies of the Bill should be made available to members 7 days earlier. This Bill was not circulated 7 days earlier. We the members of this House, are entitled to seven days' notice. I, as a member, am entitled to give my opinion on the various clauses of the Bill which will be taken into consideration by the Select Committee or the Joint Select Committee that might be constituted. For expressing my opinion thereon, I must have a copy of the Bill a few days earlier as provided in the proviso to rule 73(1). It is a mandatory provision. Since we have not had seven days' clear notice I am of the opinion that the motion itself is not in order. The Hon'ble Minister for Parliamentary Affairs referred to rules 241 and 242. I do not think it is correct. It must be read from rule 240 onwards. Only if the Assembly passes a motion desiring to obtain consent of the Council, you can set up a Joint Select Committee and then only rule 242 is attracted. Rule 240 can be complied with only on the basis of rule 74(1), namely, that the minister should first move for introduction of the Bill and it must come for consideration and at the time of consideration I have a right to say that public opinion may be elicited or that it may be referred to a Joint Select Committee, and not earlier to that. Now, he wants to skip over all this and it is violation of the rules. Apart from that, I am denied the right to send any instruction through the Assembly to the Joint Select Committee under 74(5) because it has not come seven days earlier. I am also denied the right under rule 73(2) because it says:

5-30 P.M.

“.....if the member in charge moves that his Bill be taken into consideration, any member may move as an amendment that the Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by a date to be specified in the motion.”

(SRI M. S. KRISHNAN)

I do not think the purpose of these rules is to see that some Bill which is moved in a hush hush fashion is passed because the Minister is in post-haste to pass it. It appears to me that somehow he wants this to be referred to a Joint Select Committee ignoring all procedures which the Chair should not accept because you are the custodian of our rights. I request you to see that the contentions of the hon'ble minister are not upheld and my contentions are upheld.

SRI L. SRIKANTAIH.—I am not clear in which House this Bill was for the first time originated. I want to know from the Minister whether this Bill was introduced first in the Assembly or whether it was introduced first in the Council. I understand it is not a money bill and except money Bill other Bills can be introduced in either House. Another doubt is, whether appointment of the Joint Select Committee can be made even without a Bill of this type being moved for consideration in this House. If I understand the rules correctly, that is my surmise, a motion for the appointment of the Joint Select Committee arises only when this House has expressed its willingness and the Council also has expressed its willingness. Then only the subsequent motion will arise.

SRI S. S. SHETTAR.—I want to submit one thing. Rule 242 says:

"Where a message is received from the Council desiring the concurrence of the Assembly for setting up a Joint Select Committee and its proposed total strength and requesting the nomination of members to the Joint Select Committee as required under rule 243, such concurrence and nomination may be given on motion made by a Minister in the case of a Government Bill and any member in the case of any other Bill."

First of all in the initial stage what is required is whether we have received a message from the Council for the concurrence to the appointment of a Joint Select Committee. What is mentioned is that the Minister is going to move for concurrence of the Assembly to appoint a Joint Select Committee. On the table of the House there is no mention or message of the Council seeking concurrence for appointment of Joint Select Committee. We do not know whether this House has received that message. In the initial stage that is important. I endorse the arguments put forward by Sri Krishnan and Sri Srikantaiah.

†SRI L. SRIKANTAIH.—One more point, I want to add Sir. My friend Sri Shettar has asked whether a message is received from the Council or not. How can this message be received? The power to receive message can be derived only from rule 241. It says :

"On the adoption of such a motion a message shall be sent to the Council informing it accordingly and desiring its concurrenceetc."

This message is on the basis of rule 241, Rule 241 comes in on the adoption of a motion. How can this motion come up? It is on the basis of rule 240. So if rule 240 has to be complied with, the entire provision of rules 73 and 74 have to be complied with and if they are not complied with, the Minister cannot be permitted to move the motion.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—I am indeed thankful to the hon'ble members for enlightening this House on the Rules of Procedure. These four hon'ble members Sri Nagappa, Sri Krishnan, Sri Srikantaiah and Sri Shettar are all sitting in one line. I must confess that certain points which the hon'ble members have raised are matters which have to be observed before making a motion under rule 242. Before making the motion, whether a message is received by this House from the Upper House will have to be conveyed to the Hon'ble members. That disposes of one objection, I am sure the hon'ble Speaker will convey the message.

Secondly the other point that was raised was shortage of time. There seems to be some force in what they say. Rules 240 and 241 were also pointed out. If the hon'ble members carefully read the provisions they will find that they are beside the point. They refer to an occasion when this House makes a reference to a Joint Select Committee.

Mr. Nagappa has raised another point, under proviso to Rule 74 (4), which requires a time of 2 days. Mr. Krishnan, an alert member also pointed out rule No. 73 wherein it requires a period of 7 days. Sir, may I point out to the Hon'ble members of this house that even Rule 73 is not to the point. It refers to a motion for reference to the Select Committee from this House. On such occasion it requires 7 days notice. Then I am thankful to the Hon'ble member Sri Nagappa for pointing out to the last portion of the proviso to Rule 74 (4) which vests power with the Speaker to allow the motion to be made earlier. We will come to the point—supposing you are pleased to permit me to make a motion earlier; whether it is going to affect the rights of the Hon'ble members? If I am convinced that it is going to affect the rights of the Hon'ble members, I would not hesitate to take back the motion or the motion will be made some time later on a different occasion. We shall take into consideration the nature of the Bill. It is an amending Bill and no new principles are involved. The only principle that is involved is to adopt the procedure that is involved in preparing the electoral rolls under the Representation of the peoples Act. In bigger Cities the people will be migrating from one place to another and their addresses would not be correct even though they happen to live in the same City. That is the only change that is made here. Therefore, I say that this is not going to take away the rights of the Hon'ble members, if the Hon'ble Speaker permits me to make the motion earlier.

Sri L. SRIKANTAIAH.—The Bill is the Bombay Provincial Municipal Corporations (Extension and Amendment) Bill, 1968. To my knowledge excepting the City of Bangalore in the whole of Mysore State there are no other Corporations. The Bombay Provincial Municipal Corporation Act has been enacted and passed by the Bombay Assembly. Therefore, this cannot be applied to the Corporation of the City of Bangalore or any other Corporation, if any, in the Mysore State. It cannot be introduced here.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—I am not rushing this legislation. The proposal is to have it referred to a Joint Select Committee. Therefore in the light of all these things, I do not think, it takes away the rights of the Hon'ble members of this House. Hon'ble Member Sri Srikantaiah is pointing out whether the introduction of the Bill is necessary, and whether the consideration of the motion is necessary. At this stage when I wanted to move the motion for concurrence for referring it to the Joint Select Committee, the discussion took place regarding the scope of consideration of motion. I think there is no difficulty for taking it up now provided if you permit me.

M. NAGAPPA.—There is a lot of confusion and difficulties also. This Act has been passed under a different atmosphere by a different Assembly. This Act was in force before the commencement of the Constitution. There is an article in the Constitution, that if there is an Act before the commencement of the Constitution, it should be continued until it is replaced. There are so many complications which should be looked into by the Joint Select Committee. It is an important Bill. Every clause and provisos should be gone into in detail. The Government always want to supersede the Corporations. Let the Council Members go through the entire clauses of the Bill again and come to definite decisions. Therefore, the power vested in the Chair should not be exercised and it should not be the order of the day. Therefore, the Hon'ble Chair Should not permit the motion to be moved.

Sri M. S. KRISHNAN.—Arguments were advanced to see that the motion should be allowed to be moved. There are rules of procedure and we have to be guided by these rules of procedure. Unless you choose to suspend the rules, this cannot be done. Setting up of a Joint Select Committee is different. Chapter XI of the Rules of Procedure lays down as to how the legislation is to take place in this House. This particular Chapter says how a Joint Select Committee should be set up. The point that arises here is whether the Hon'ble Minister can straightforwardly refer the matter to the Joint Select Committee. As I said there is some procedure to be adopted in this connection. I want to know whether that procedure has been followed.

The question that is raised is very important. Can this House straight-way refer a particular Bill to the Joint Select committee on a message being received from the Council ? Now what is sought to be done by the Hon'ble Minister is this. A message has been received ; we are going to read it and refer the Bill to a Joint Select Committee. The

most important question is: supposing a message has been received, are we in this Assembly straightforwardly to accept this proposal to refer it to a Joint Select Committee without considering the Bill? Should we not discuss and see if it is necessary to refer it to elicit public opinion? In my opinion, no Bill can be sent straightforwardly to a Joint Select Committee on a motion made under 242 which refers to a message received. I submit with great respect to the Council that unless and until this House discusses the question and comes to the conclusion after due discussion that it should be referred to Joint Select Committee or for the purpose of eliciting public opinion, it cannot be done. That is why I say that the whole scheme is sought to be set at naught by quoting rule 242. Rule 242 is being read out of context. Rule 242 has to be read with rules 241 and 240. If it is read out of context, what the Hon'ble Minister says has to be accepted. If it is read in proper context, what I say has to be accepted.

The Hon'ble Member says that the rights of Members are not curtailed; it is a very small Bill; it does not contain very many provisions, there is no time etc. He tries to belittle the Bill itself. I am astonished that this Bill which changes the whole character of the Corporation is brought in such a fashion. The Corporation in Bombay enjoys much more autonomy than the Corporation in our State. I have not had time to read the Bill I got it only yesterday night. I had no time. The question of autonomy is involved in this; the question of single member constituency or double member constituency is also involved in this. These are basic question and not small ones. I cannot consider this amending Bill is a very small Bill. It is an important Bill which changes the character of the Corporation. This is an important Bill which must be approached as a Bill under Chapter XI under the title Legislation. This is a Bill which must be moved as set out in that chapter, it must be considered and discussed as stated in that Chapter and then we must decide whether it is fit to be sent to Joint Select Committee or whether it has to be sent for eliciting public opinion. Hence, I say that my fundamental right of discussing this Bill and offering my opinion on this Bill is affected and the Hon'ble Minister is trying to manoeuvre and I humbly request the Chair that he may not be allowed to manoeuvre in this way.

MR. SPEAKER.—I want to ask one point. I have been trying to find out the correct position. The Hon'ble Member need not be under the impression that there is any prejudice or preference so far as the Chair is concerned, one way or the other. I am only loudly thinking. I want to share my thoughts before coming to a decision. Now supposing a motion is moved under rule 242: what would be the effect? It does not mean that the House will be accepting the principle of the Bill which is to be referred to joint select committee. The House is only giving its concurrence as per the message. After the Bill emerges from the Select Committee, the entire procedure right from rule 71 will have to be followed. The House is not accepting any proposition, either the basic principle of the Bill or anything of the type. Some sort of a device is

(MR. SPEAKER)

adopted in order to save time. Therefore, I am just thinking whether any difficulty would arise if the House accept the message as per the motion and nominates its representatives to serve on the joint select committee. After the Bill emerges out of the joint select committee, the entire procedure regarding legislation will have to be followed here. The concurrence, of this House does not in any way show that it has accepted the principle or anything of the type. It only means that this House is co-operating with the other House in expediting the whole procedure. Supposing the Chair takes that view, in what way, do the members think they will be losing any right?

Sri M. S. KRISHNAN.—I would like to submit that the proposition which you were pleased to make namely, that it is a question of expediting the matter—that does not arise here at all. We are also interested in expediting matters and we are interested in seeing as far as possible more autonomy is there in the functioning of the Corporation. We are all fighting for that very principle. We are carrying on a very big struggle to see that the elections to the Bangalore Corporation are held.

What I am trying to point out is another matter. I would like to ask the first question, whether the Hon'ble Minister can move a motion under 242. That must be answered before he moves. My sub mission is, he cannot move a motion under 242 unless 241 is complied with.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Rule 241 says that only when a Bill is introduced in this House and it is being referred to the joint select committee, this House can send a message. Here is a case where the Bill has originated in the other House.

Sri M.S. KRISHNAN.—Rule 240 says:

“(1) The Assembly may by a motion desire to obtain the concurrence of the Council in setting up a Joint Select Committee of the two Houses to consider A bill, and such a motion shall state the total number of members of both the Houses to be appointed to the Committee and the names of the Members of the Assembly who in accordance with the proportion mentioned in rule 241 are to serve thereon.”

The motion is not only to consider the Bill or in regard to the introduction of the Bill, the motion is regarding the desire to obtain the concurrence of the council in setting up a Joint Select Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Bills other than money Bills, can originate either in this House or in the Council.

6.00 P.M.

This Bill, as far as I can understand, originated in the Council. Bills originating in this House can also be contemplated. When a Bill

originates in this House and a motion is brought under Rule 240 desiring to set up a Joint Select Committee of the two Houses to consider it, this House can send a message to the Council under Rule 241. It is vice versa when the Bill originates in the Council. The Council members set up a Joint Select Committee and desire for our concurrence.

SRI K. H. PATIL.—We have reached a stage when we should be allowed to return to our constituencies and attend to our work. We have reached the fag end of the day and it is high time we adjourn without transacting any more business. Nothing will collapse if this Bill is postponed for consideration to the next Session. Apart from rules and regulations, I want to impress on the hon. Minister Sri Puttaswamy that he has brought this Bill in public interest and in order to safeguard public interest opportunities should be given to this House to express the views of the Members and then refer it to the Joint Select Committee. After all, the Joint Select Committee have to base their recommendations and discussions on the observations and consensus of opinion expressed here; the Committee is only an intermediate stage. Therefore, better the consideration of this Motion is deferred to the next Session.

SRI H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Now it is already 6 P.M. Normally the procedure in this House on the last day is, we are not expected to work so hard as you want us to do. You have become a hard taskmaster on the last day. Many members are desirous of expressing their views on this Bill. Though it is in the form of some amendments, it is an important measure. I am appealing to the Chair to adjourn the House. If anything is left over, we can carry it over to the next Session.

MR. SPEAKER.—The Chair would like to have the views of the hon. Minister for Parliamentary Affairs.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪಟ್ಟನಾಯಕ್. —ನಾನು ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಕೃಷ್ಣನ್ ಅವರು ಎರಡು ಮಾತ್ರಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಾನು ಒಂದು ಮಾತ್ರ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈ ಸಭೆಯು ಗೌರವವನ್ನು ಕಾಪಾಡಬೇಕಾದ್ದು ಎಲ್ಲಿರ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯ. ಯಾರಾ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೂ ಹ್ಯಾತಿ ಬಂದಂತೆ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಅವೇಕ್ಕ ನಮಗ್ನಿ. ಚೊಂಬಾಯಿ ಪ್ರದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಅನ್ಯಾಯಾಗತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಒಂದು ಕಾನಂತು ಆಗುವಾದಕ್ಕೆ 12 ವರ್ಷ ಅದನ್ನು 12 ತಿಂಗಳು ಕಾದರೆ ತರುತ್ತು ಮೇಲನ ಕ್ರಿಯವೇನೂ ಕೆಳಗೆ ಬೀಳುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂಬುದು ನನ್ನ ಭಾವನೆ. ಮತ್ತು ಈ ಸಭೆ ಇರುತ್ತಿದ್ದ ಕಾಲವನ್ನು ಸದುತ್ಯೋಗಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಏನು ವರ್ಷದ್ವಯಿಂದ, ಇದನ್ನು ಸಾಧ್ಯ ದಾದೃಷ್ಯ ಜಾಗೃತುಯಾಗಿ, ಜೆನಾಗ್ನಿ ಸಮಗ್ರವಾದ ಒಂದು ಕಾನಂತು ಮಾಡುವ ಒಂದು ಅಭಿರೂಪೆಯಿಂದ ನಾನು ಇದನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲ ತಂದಿದ್ದೇನೆಯೇ ಹೇರತು, ಇದನ್ನು ಪಾನು ಮಾಡಿದೆ ನನ್ನ ತರುತ್ತು ಮೇಲೆ ಕಂಡ ಬರುತ್ತಿದೆ ಎನ್ನುತ್ತ ಭಾವನೆಯಿಂದ ನಾನು ಇದನ್ನು ತಂದಿಲ್ಲ. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಕೃಷ್ಣನ್ ಅದರ ಹೇಳಿದರು, ಯಾವೋತ್ತ ಈ ಸಭೆಯುಲ್ಲಿ ಬಿದಾರ್ಯಾಪಾರಿತವಾದ ಮಾತ್ರಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿಪುಡು ಒಳ್ಳಿಯಾದು ಎಂದು. ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯುಲ್ಲಿ ಬಿಲಿಟ್ ಮಾಡುವ ಉದ್ದೇಶ ನಾಗೆ ಇಲ್ಲ. ನಾನು ಆರಿತ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕವನ್ನೂ ಅಲ್ಲ. ನನ್ನ ಯೋಗ್ಯತೆ ಏನೇ ಇರಲ ನಾನು ದೊಡ್ಡವರ ಅಶ್ರಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಬೇಕಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಎಂತಹ ನಂದಭರ ಬಂದರೂ ನಾನು ದೊಡ್ಡಿಗೆ ಕೆಯಿಂದ ನಡೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅದ್ದಿಂದ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಕೃಷ್ಣನ್ ಅವರು ಬಿಲಿಟ್ ಮಾಡಿದರು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದು ನಾಯಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀಮಾರ್ತಿ ಕೃಷ್ಣನೇ ಅವರು ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಏಷಿಯನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದರು, ಅದ್ದೇನಂದರೆ “ಜಾತಿ ಅಶ್ವ ಎ ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರ ಮನ್ಯಾಚಿವ್ಯಾ” ಎಂದು ಇಂಥಾ ಪದ ಶ್ರವೇಣಿಗನ್ನು ವಾಸ್ಯ ಸರವ್ಯರು ವಾದಿದ್ದೇ ಇಲ್ಲವೆದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯಾದು, 215 ಜನ ಸರವ್ಯರಿಗೂ ಪರೋ ವಾಡಿ ಕೃತ್ಯಾ ಮನ್ಯಾದಾ ವಾದಾದುತ್ತೇನೇ ಎನ್ನು ವಾಸ್ಯವಾದಾನ ವಾಸ್ಯ ಸರವ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಬೇಡ. ಅವ್ಯಾರಿಂದ ಈ ವಾಕ್ಯವೆನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭ್ಯಿಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆ ವಾಪಿಪುರವಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಾರಕಾಶ ಬೇಡ ಎಂಬ ವಾಸ್ಯ ಸರವ್ಯರು ಒತ್ತಾಯಿ ವಾಪಿವಾಗ ನಾವಾದರೂ ಈ ಘಾತಕೀಕು ಎಂದಿಲ್ಲ. ನ್ಯಾ ಬುಮಾ ಭಾವನೆ ಏನಿದೆ ಎಂದರ ಜವವರಿ ತಿಂಗಳಿಂದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಸಭೆ ಸೇರಿದರೆ ಆಗ ಇಮ್ಮ ಕಾನೂನಾಗುಂಪಾಕ್ಕೆ ಅರಕಾಶ ಅವರಿ ವಾಡೆಣಿಣಿ. ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಏಂದೆ ಅವಕ್ಕೆ ಮನ್ಯಾ ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರದೆಣಿಕಾದ್ದು ಸನ್ಯ ಅದ್ಯ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯ. ಅನೇಕರಿಂದ ನಾನು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಗೌರವವನ್ನು ಇಚ್ಛಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೇ. ಆ ರೀತಿ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಗೌರವವನ್ನು ಇಟ್ಟಿಕೊಂಡಿರಕ್ಕು ಅ ತೇರ್ಕ ವಾಸ್ಯ ಸರವ್ಯರು ಈ ಮನೊದೆಯನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚೆ ವಾಪಿಪುರಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಾರಕಾಶ ಬೇಡ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವಾಗ ನಾನು ಅವಶ್ಯಕವಾಗಿ ಇವನ್ನು ಬಿಂಬಿಕೊಂಡುತ್ತೇನೇ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I do not like to inconvenience the Members any longer.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—The hon'ble Member Sri Jatti is standing and seems intending to make a statement. Let us hear him.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Yes.

NOTICE OF ADJOURNMENT MOTION BY SRI H. SIDDAVEERAPPA

(continued)

† Sri B. D. JATTI (Jamkhandi).—Mr. Speaker Sir, the hon'ble Member Sri H. M. Chaunabasappa had given notice of an adjournment motion regarding the Hemavathi Project. There were some discussions about it here on the floor of the House. Ultimately, after discussion I want to make a suggestion that a meeting should be held on the 3rd of next month at 10 A.M. at Bangalore and the hon'ble Chief Minister should arrange this meeting. Sri Channabasappa, who has studied the subject very well, should be invited to the meeting. Along with him, the leading persons of the areas which are to be affected, may also be invited. In addition to the Leader of the Opposition, Members who are interested in the Projects may also be invited. If this arrangement is made, it will be satisfactory to the entire House. I hope the hon'ble Chief Minister will agree to this suggestion. I also request the hon'ble Speaker not to give his ruling on the special motion; let us be held over.

Sri VEERENDRA PATIL.—I fully agree with the views expressed just now by my esteemed friend Mr. Jatti. As suggested by him, I am quite willing to convene the meeting on the 3rd of next month at 10 A.M. or at any time that is suitable. I will arrange the meeting and have our Engineers and other Officers in that meeting. I will give full opportunity to all the Members who are interested in this problem.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—Mr. Speaker Sir, I am glad that the Members of this House have appreciated the importance of the issue